

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND
5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333-0001

AMC PAMPHLET
NO. 715-19

14 December 1999

Procurement

PROCUREMENT BUSINESS PROCESS GROUPS GUIDE

SUMMARY: This guide is to help the procurement business process group (BPG) to operate in a uniform and consistent manner. The need for this publication arises from frequent turnover of BPG members and chairpersons and the fact that other BPGs have developed independent operating procedures. Specifically, this guide addresses BPG structuring, general operating procedures, and Engineering Change Proposals (ECP) definitions, processing and management.

APPLICABILITY: This guide applies to the procurement BPG that functions as the official interface between Army Materiel Command (AMC) automated systems users and the developers.

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS: The proponent of this publication is the Integrated Procurement Systems Office. Users are invited to send recommendations and suggested improvements on DA Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms) directly to HQ AMC (AMCRDA-AT), 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-0001.

DISTRIBUTION RESTRICTIONS: This publication contains operational information that is for official Government use only. Distribution is limited to U.S. Government agencies. Request from outside the U.S. Government for release of this publication under the Freedom of Information Act of the Foreign Military Sales Program must be made to HQ AMC (AMCRDA-AT), Alexandria, VA 22333-0001.

1. PURPOSE: This guide is intended to help the BPGs operate in a uniform and consistent manner. The need for such assistance arises from the frequent turnover of BPG members and chairpersons and the fact that each BPG has developed independent operating procedures.

2. REFERENCES:

a. AR 25-1, The Army Information Resources Management Program.

b. AMC Regulation 15-10, Information Management Support Council (IMSC).

3. POLICIES: The procurement BPGs are the vehicle for expressing functional users' requirements for automated systems. BPGs are established at the direction of the individual functional deputy chief of staff HQ AMC. A formal BPG Charter may provide the necessary authorization for the group to function. The BPG chairperson is selected from functional elements under the appropriate deputy chief of staff (DCS), HQ AMC. The BPG chairperson reports to the respective deputy chief of staff and is expected to justify their requirements for systems changes and projects. BPG responsibilities include...

- 0 Identification of opportunities for standardization of automated systems and application enhancements.

- 0 Solution of problems in which automation can provide significant improvements in Army readiness and/or productivity gain.

- 0 Initiation of new automation systems development and overseeing the entire development process.

- 0 Coordination with the central design activity/application system developer (LSSC/CIC) on functional workload and system development/maintenance.

a. Organization. The typical BPG has 12-15 members. BPG members represent the following organizations:

- 0 Functional DCS, HQ AMC (responsible for chairperson)

- 0 Installations, MSCs, and SRA that are system users or contributors.

- 0 The appropriate computer design activity (CDA)

O The applicable proponent agency.

O The applicable training activity.

b. Nucleus: The BPG has a minimum nucleus of members that provides representation for each system user. These principals, along with adjunct participants, come from AMC elements that have a vested interest in the functional area of a specific BPG. Adjunct members from non-AMC commands and agencies may participate in all BPG matters. Representatives from the Defense Logistics Agency, General Services Administration, U. S. Army Security Assistance Center, Defense Finance Accounting Services, for example, may represent their organizations concerning particular BPG matters. Members should be supported by primary and secondary alternates; who can knowledgeably participate in BPG matters in lieu of principal members. It is essential that principal BPG members and their alternatives have sufficient experience and knowledge to perform required duties within their particular BPG.

c. Functional Area: The AMC procurement automation efforts are organized into two functional areas -- AMC Commodity Command Standard System (CCSS); and Procurement Automated Data and Document System (PADDS). Both functional areas require knowledgeable BPG personnel.

d. BPG Duties. The duties of the BPG will be made a part of assigned job description. BPG chairmanship is generally a full-time assignment.

4. PROCEDURES: The primary vehicle for automated systems development and modification is the Engineering Change Proposal (ECP). Existing policy requires the commander of each AMC command, installations or activity, which is an automated system user, to appoint a System Change Control Officer (SCCO). The SCCO is the responsible person for the processing of ECPs.

a. ECP types. ECPs to be discussed generally are for new system design, system modification, or systems maintenance. These are referred to as routine. Additionally there are two types of quick ECPs -- Emergency and Urgent.

(1) An emergency ECP is one required to correct a condition which caused an application to fail to perform in the production environment at the user site. For emergency ECPs, the user, or preferably the SCCO, telephonically communicates the emergency condition to the appropriate CDA.

The CDA is required to correct the deficiency and furnish corrected software to affected users within 48 hours after receipt

of the emergency ECP. For emergency ECPs, the necessary ECP number must still be assigned by the originating command, and the appropriate documents are usually processed after the corrected software distributed.

(2) Urgent ECPs are required because an Automatic Data System (ADS) application may cause severe impairment of mission accomplishment such as erroneous file updates, loss of records, non-acceptance of valid input, creation of invalid output, or severe documentation deficiencies. The urgent ECP is forwarded to the appropriate CDA via telephone or E-Mail message. All ECPs for a system in the prototype phase of development are classified as urgent. This is intended to ensure that the prototype test can proceed with a minimum amount of interruption. The prototype ECPs are transmitted directly to the CDA and do not require normal processing and approval. All other urgent ECPs should be authorized by the Business Process Manager over his/her electronic approval. The system functional proponents and BPG chairperson receive urgent ECPs because they must be kept aware of changes, which could impact applications for which they have functional responsibility. Their input on the urgency and content of the ECP request should be transmitted to the head BPG member in their chain of command, LSSC, CIC and the executive secretary of each BPG who will monitor the use of the urgent designation for signs of potential misuse. A different procedure is used for the routine case.

b. Routine Processing. The processing point at AMCOM (PROCBPM) receives the ECP and reviews it for completion. Once that is completed they will make distribution to the other BPG members and the CDAs for review and concurrence/non-concurrence. The design directorate at the CDA ensures that the ECP is appropriate and are responsible for estimating the costs associated performing the ECP. The cost/benefit analysis is a significant factor in determining the merits for the submitted ECP regardless of type.

c. ECP Management. The life cycle of an ECP starts with the requester. The ECP is prepared by the requester via E-mail. (See attached format) The requester or ECP originator is responsible for the preparation of the benefit analysis that is required prior to submission of the ECP. Benefit analyses should include administrative lead-time reductions, man-hours and machine time savings and productivity improvements that will minimize the need for future personnel and hardware increases.

(1) Quick ECPs require limited BPG involvement, so the primary BPG emphasis is on routine ECPs. As mentioned above, it

is forwarded to the design directorate at the CDA for quick action.

(2) The CDA design directorate/division is responsible for maintaining a file of current routine and urgent ECPs by BPG area. Prior to BPG meetings, the design directorate/division is responsible for the distribution of all current routine ECPs in the read-ahead package. The read-ahead package should be shared with the BPG member and the functional application experts at his/her command. This distribution should be completed no later than (NLT) 2 weeks prior to the start of routine BPG meetings.

d. Meetings. The primary business of the BPG is conducted at meetings. BPG meetings are held as necessary--usually several times each year--to accomplish the mission. Prototype review meetings will try to be held at prototype sites when available other wise at the CDA. Meetings commonly last one week or less, and are primarily convened to manage the flow of ECPs through the development portion of their life cycle. More specifically, BPGs conduct meetings to accomplish the following principal objectives:

- Evaluation of ECPs in backlog and workload prioritization.
- In-process review of ECP work
- Life cycle management.

(1) BPG meetings may address any combination of these objectives depending on the nature of the workload before the group. Some BPG meetings will devide in subgroups to focus on different aspects of the business at hand; this mode of operation is an effective way of reducing resource consumption. Minutes of BPG meetings are normally distributed NLT 2 weeks after the meeting to the appropriate AMC functional DCS, the BPG members, and the CDAs.

(2) The evaluation of the ECPs in the read-ahead package includes a review of the new ECPs and the ECPs that remain in backlog of work to be performed. The BPG must consider the cost/benefits, command direction, and interaction with other automation initiatives. BPGs must also remember that ECPs are written to implement automation initiatives rather than create new policy. Since most users develop their own bridges in association with AMC standard systems, BPGs must consider the possibility that one or more bridges might satisfy an ECP. This is the vehicle by which AMC standardizes its systems. The number of ECPs targeted for evaluation may occasionally exceed one hundred.

e. Evaluation Specifics. The evaluation process for ECPs can be subdivided into six specific functions: approval/ disapproval,

cancellation, consolidation, deferment, transfer-ence, and prioritization.

(1) The BPG may disapprove a new ECP if the group decides the ECP possesses insufficient merit to warrant the cost involved. Obviously the costs and benefits are major consideration, along with command direction, in determining the merits of the ECP. Identification of a command-unique bridge that approximates that the ECP will result in an approved ECP once it is incorporated into the system for common use. If an ECP is approved either as is or with modifications, then it is subject to the appropriate evaluation process described below.

(2) The cancellation of an ECP may be warranted if the particular ECP is in the backlog of ECPs to be worked, but is overtaken by recent developments. These developments may include new command guidance, policy changes, or other reasons which logically justify cancellation. The backlog of ECPs should be carefully reviewed with an eye toward cancellation or consolidation when possible.

(3) If an ECP has sufficient merit to avoid disapproval or cancellation, it may be meaningfully consolidated with other ECPs. Consolidation will reduce the size of backlog along with saving time and money that might be spent processing the same but separate ECPs. ECPs should also be consolidated into groupings affecting related programs to permit the CDA programmers to function more efficiently.

(4) The BPG may defer judgement on an ECP if the documentation of the ECP is incomplete or if the BPG members declare that they require more information before evaluating the ECP. The BPG should defer action if the ECP is lacking adequate cost/benefit information. An ECP may be deferred if the description is incomplete or nebulous to the extent that the BPG cannot readily determine the merits of the ECP. In these situations, the ECP should be returned to the originator for further information and clarification.

(5) The BPG may transfer the ECP to another BPG (see Table 1) if, upon reviewing the ECP, the group determines that it more appropriately belongs within the scope of another BPG. Since the mission of each BPG is related to the mission of other BPGs, an ECP may properly be addressed by two or more BPGs. However, only one BPG may serve as the proponent for each ECP. This should not limit a BPG from soliciting recommendations or input from other BPGs.

(6) ECPs that survive the above processes are considered to possess sufficient merit to warrant tasking the CDAs to perform the changes. In order for the CDA to undertake the viable ECPs, they may first be prioritized by the BPG. The BPG must again review the screened ECPs to determine the relative merits of each against the other screened ECPs. Because in procurement we block fund our CDA's for the year, impact on the command, economic merit, command emphasis, and life cycle management are the primary factors in determining prioritization of valid ECPs. The CDAs with the support of the BPM and PROCBPM prepares the integrated workplan. Once the ECP enters the workplan, the BPG should consider the training requirements associated with the new ECP. Determination of training needs as early as possible affords the commands more time to prepare or revise training programs as appropriate.

f. IPRs. In addition to reviewing the read-ahead package of ECPs, the BPG meets to review in-process work being performed by the CDAs. This is work the BPG initiated via the ECP process described above. The BPG should monitor the process of the CDA developing, programming, implementing, and proliferating the ECPs.

g. Proliferation. BPGs are encouraged to recommend proliferation of system change, which still has minor problems in the prototype phase, if the BPG ascertains that these problems can be readily overcome. The analogy between weapon systems development and automated systems development applies here. New weapon systems go into production even when a degree of risk is still inherent in the system, so long as the degree of risk involved is considered acceptable. The Army must be willing to accept a comparable degree of uncertainty with automated systems, particularly with respect to new design and changes. If the ECP approves the proliferation of a system change, then the CDA is responsible for the dissemination of the system change throughout the command. For noncommand users to review the system changes, the BPM must direct the CDA to include such users on the dissemination list.

h. Life Cycle Management. For an automated system new design or major modification, the BPG may convene prior to Milestone 0 (project initiation) to develop the Mission Element Needs Statement (MENS).

(1) The CDA requires the MENS in order to develop the cost estimate for the new design/major modification. The BPG must consider technological advances, new policy direction, and the needs of the command in preparing the MENS. The MENS describes the mission need; it is not a list of hardware and software.

(2) During the Definition/Design Phase leading to Milestone II, the BPG may convene to define and establish the functional description (FD) for the new design/major modification. The CDA may assist in the development of the FD, but the BPG has the final FD responsibility. Typically, joint development of the FD by the BPG and the CDA functional developers is the rule.

The proponent of this supplement is the United States Army Materiel Command. Users are invited to send comments and suggested improvements on DA Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms) to Commander, HQ AMC, ATTN: AMCRDA, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-0001.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

OFFICIAL:

CHARLES S. MAHAN, JR.
Major General, USA
Chief of Staff

CAROLYN GEBRE
Acting Chief, Printing and
Publications Branch

DISTRIBUTION:

Initial Distr H (43) 1 ea HQ Acty/Staff Ofc
LEAD (SIOLE-DO-I) (2)
AMCIO-I-SP stockroom (15)
Separate Reporting Activities (SRA) (2 ea)
AMCOM/AMSAM-RM-FD (4)
AMCOM/AMSAM-SMO (Library) (4)
ARL/AMSRL-CI-TG (4)
CECOM/AMSEL-IM-BM-I (4)
IOC/AMSIO-IMC (4)
LOGSA/AMXLS-IM (4)
SBCCOM/AMSSB-SCI-H (4)
STRICOM/AMSTI-CS (4)
TACOM/AMSTA-RM-DCR (4)
USASAC/AMSAC-IM-O (4)

"THIS IS OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE"

SUBJECT: SYSTEM PROPOSAL

1. Functional Data:

BPG Affected: Procurement

2. Administrative Data:

A. SP Number:

B. SP Title:

C. System ID:

D. SP Originator:

E. Prototype Site:

3. Category: I

4. Problem Description:

5. Proposed Solution:

6. Benefits:

7. Regulatory Requirements that are Impetus for change:

8. Classification of Equipment (replacement, productivity or new mission) if applicable:

9. License Fees:

10. Estimated Cost: a. MSC - b. CDA -

11. Estimated Savings: N/A.

*Are costs or savings expected to cross more than one FY?

12. Impact if not funded:

13. This problem has been discussed with:

14. POC for this action is:

Approved by

AMC APPROVAL AND FUNDING APPROVED BY:

DISTRIBUTION:

AMSTA-AQ-DAC

AMSMI-AC-MS

AMSMC-ABS-P

AMCRDA-AT

MSEL-AC-SB-AA

AMSAT-A-AC

AMXSI-CL

AMSMC-ABS-P

AMSMI-AIS-FA

Encl 1

Table 1.

AMC-WIDE STANDARD SYSTEMS

CCSS Business Process Managers

Logistics

Logistic Data
Requirements
Asset Management
Major Items

Financial

DFAS systems
BRIMS

Transportation

Packaging
Transportation

Support

Security Assistance
Technical
War Reserve

Encl 2